

TO: Harold Weisberg, 7627 Old Receiver Road  
Frederick, MD 21702  
FROM: George Michael Evica  
107 North Beacon St., Hartford, CT 06105  
201-232-9673  
DATE: 6/25/93; Revised, 6/28/93 and 7/12/93  
RE: Weisberg Letter of 6/21/93: on the Third Decade Conference

First: your heading: My name is not "George Evita." My "first" name is 'George Michael' (named at birth after two maternal uncles) and my "last" name is 'Evica.' My full and legal name is, therefore, George Michael Evica.

Second: about your letter's content:

1. "...if in rational circles what you engaged in can be styled as research...."

On what factual basis, having neither attended the conference nor read the papers, do you negatively criticize what we have done?

2. "...request a 'research paper' on me as 'a significant source of disinformation...?'"

You are wrong twice. I wrote to 30 writers and researchers asking each to consider responding (first with an abstract, and if accepted, with a paper), to a specific question (or several questions). Each person received a different question or questions. The questions were meant to be provocative, and they resulted (beyond those abstracts and papers sent in independently) in two additional excellent paper proposals and two excellent letters, both of which are of publishable quality if Third Decade editor Jerry Rose sees fit to do so. A third letter, in effect an extended abstract, I received from David Wrone. I had asked David to respond--not to any topic--but to two questions: "[1.] Has Harold Weisberg been a significant source of disinformation in the JFK assassination [and 2.] Why?"

You know, Mr. Weisberg, that you have made a series of negative comments about and accusations against (whether true or not) some JFK researchers and writers (sometimes in private, sometimes in letters, sometimes in the media), and that at least some researchers have felt that, despite your magnificent work on the JFK case, you were a public liability. Let me be very clear about the last statement. I do not believe you are a public liability, but others do. So I wrote to David, without the above preliminaries, to provoke almost precisely what he indeed sent me: a spirited defense of your career and work. Had he agreed to expand his letter, I am certain his paper would have been one of the important moments of the conference. But as his letter states, he did not want "to tackle the subject." David wrote: "I gave careful thought to your urging request. I must say no."

I say "almost precisely" because David did make charges against two well-known JFK writers, and, if these charges were published, might be actionable, whether the charges were true or not. It will be up to Third Decade editor Rose whether he wishes